

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-22 were originally filed in this patent application. In the pending office action, claim 21 was objected to for a formality and claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,831,623 to Terzian. No claim was allowed. Claims 1, 8, 16, 19 and 21 have been amended and claim 18 has been cancelled herein. Claims 1-17 and 19-22 are currently pending.

REMARKS

Objection to the specification under 37 CFR 1.77(b)

The Examiner objected to the specification under 37 CFR 1.77(b). The objection is unclear. The application is arranged in the preferred layout. The sections of the application are in the preferred order, but do have slightly different heading names. The Examiner has cited 37 CFR 1.77(b) which states that it “**should** include the following” (emphasis added). Further the Examiner has stated the guidelines are “**suggested** for the Applicant’s use”. Applicant is not able to discern what does not meet the Examiner’s approval in relation to the suggested format and under what requirement the objections is being made. The Examiner is requested to give a specific objection. Does the Examiner mean to say that the “suggested guidelines” are not guidelines, but absolute requirements that must be followed exactly? This is contrary to the language in 37 CFR 1.77(b). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Objection to claim 21

The Examiner objected to claim 21 for an informality. The claim has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Reconsideration of claim 21 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Terzian. Applicant traverses the Examiner’s finding of anticipation. Terzian teaches a swap scan register that can exchange the contents of an operational register and a test register. Applicant believes the cited art does not teach or suggest the claimed invention as amended herein.

Claim 1

Claim 1 was amended to add the limitation that the data input of the second latch is not accessible except through the data output of the first latch to limit loading of data to the second latch from the first latch. Basis for this amendment can be found on page 4, lines 23-25 of the specification. No new matter has been added. The claimed register bit employs a simple second latch that is not accessible to read or write during processor execution. The second latch is loaded through the first latch (page 4, line 25 to page 5, line 2). In contrast, the latches in Terzian employ a multiplexor at each latch to allow the latches to be independently loaded from their corresponding sources. Since Terzian does not teach or suggest the second latch is not accessible except through the data output of the first latch, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 2-7

Claims 2-7 depend on claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 2-7 are allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim.

Claim 8

Claim 8 has been amended herein to contain a similar limitation as that described above with reference to claim 1. The arguments above with respect to claim 1 are included here by reference. Therefore claim 8 is also allowable over the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 9

The Examiner rejected claim 9 citing Terzian for the claim limitation of “a context switch mechanism ... that causes the data on the data output of the selected one secondary latch to be written to the primary latch” (col. 1, line 64 - col. 2, line 57, Operational data, 16b, OP REG 0 and OP REG 1, are swapped with test data, 18b, OP REG 1 and OP REG 1 respectively). Terzian teaches that the contents of the operational registers are swapped with the contents of the test registers. Terzian does not teach or suggest a plurality of secondary latches for each primary latch, and that a selected secondary latch can be written to the primary latch. In Terzian, the latches are in pairs. The latches are always swapped with their counterpart of the matching pair. Terzian does not teach or suggest a plurality of secondary latches and a data selection mechanism that selects one data output from the plurality of secondary latches to feed back to the primary latch as recited in claim 9. For this reason, claim 9 is allowable, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 10-15

Claims 10-15 depend on claim 9, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 10-15 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Claim 16

Claim 16 was amended to add the limitations of former claim 18 and to add limitations similar to the limitation added to claim 1 discussed above. The discussion above for claim 1 is included here by reference. Since Terzian does not teach or suggest the second latch is not accessible except through the data output of the first latch, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 17-18

Claim 17 depends on claim 16, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 17 is allowable as depending on allowable independent claims. Claim 18 has been cancelled.

Claim 19

Claim 19 was amended to add limitations similar to the limitation added to claim 1 discussed above. The discussion above for claim 1 is included here by reference. Since Terzian does not teach or suggest the second latch is not accessible except through the first latch, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 20

Claim 20 depends on claim 19, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 20 is allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Claim 21

Claim 21 includes limitations similar to claim 9 discussed above. The discussion above for claim 9 is included here by reference. Terzian does not teach or suggest a plurality of secondary latches and selecting one of the plurality of secondary latches for performing a context switch with the primary latch, as recited in claim 9. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 22

Claim 22 depends on claim 21, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 22 is allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Conclusion

In summary, none of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicant's claims presently on file. Therefore, applicant respectfully asserts that all of applicant's claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By /bretjpetersen/
Bret J. Petersen
Reg. No. 37,417

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 548
Carthage, MO 64836-0548
(417) 358-4700